

12 February 1951

MEMORANDUM FOR FILE

SUBJECT: Discussion on Evaluation and Requirements of O/SO

Based on a conversation of the following:

25X1
25X1
[redacted] (for part of the time)
[redacted]
Mr. Reber

1. Evaluations:

O/SO need. O/SO it appears needs to be able to get from a substantively competent quarter a judgment regarding the probable validity of information received from reports and on occasion guidance with regard to the advisability of pursuing further and possibly at some cost the acquisition of additional data along the same line. This was done by O/RE. It is not clear from this conversation that on military aspects O/RE consulted the military or provided its own (probably with non-military background) and whether the evaluation was competent under those arrangements. It seems to me in the political field O/SO must get evaluation from the State Department (both geographic desk and intelligence in State). Furthermore, O/SO will probably get a better evaluation if it does with the military what it wants to do with the State Department and the same goes for O/RR and O/SI.

2. Requirements:

The issue is to provide a means whereby O/SO can be told what to get and how important in terms of cost it is to get it. O/SO does not want to take the responsibility for the evaluation of the validity or of the importance of requirements laid on it. Obviously it cannot screen out what should be collected by avert means and what it should collect. This clearly either requires:

- a. An improved O/CD
- b. A special office in O/RR

This adds up to an argument in favor of [redacted] central administration of requirements as against the decentralized or mainly decentralized approach of O/RR and O/SI. It may be possible, though there would probably be some duplication, to expand O/CD to serve O/SO better and still allow O/RR and O/SI the right to have their own requirements division.

25X1